

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 23 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Applicant: Bolle)	Art Unit: 2625
)	
Serial No.: 09/943.896)	Examiner: Cuoso
)	
Filed: August 31, 2001)	YOR20000609US2
)	
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR FINGERPRINT)	January 23, 2006
IMAGE ENHANCEMENT USING PARTITIONED)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
LEAST-SQUARED FILTERS)	San Diego, CA 92101
)	

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTIONCommissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA

Dear Sir:

Ok to
Enter
2-9-05
gm

The allowance of Claims 1-8 and 11-24 and indicated allowability of Claim 39 in the Office Action dated December 13, 2005 is gratefully acknowledged. The sole remaining issue is the rejection of Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Clarke et al., USPN 5,825,936 (directed to identifying suspect regions of breast X-rays) in view of Chang et al., USPN 5,572,597.

Applicant believes there are three errors in the rejection, the first being the incorrect allegation that Clarke et al., col. 6, lines 20-59 teaches filters derived from expert-developed ground truth pairs. While Applicant is mindful that claims are to be broadly construed during prosecution, that does not mean that they may be so broadly construed as to remove them from meanings that the skilled artisan would ascribe to them, MPEP §2111.01. The relied-upon section of Clarke et al. teaches that in practice, since $f(i,j)$ is not available, the [ensemble mean] is derived from the degraded observation $g(i,f)$ to derive the filter expressed in equation

1201-12.AM1